

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated August 19, 2010, claims 1-15 were rejected. Herein, claims 1, 4-8, and 11-15 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Additionally, claims 3 and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration based on the following remarks.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta (US 2005/0081159) further in view of McLaren (US 6,064,794). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-noted rejection in view of the following.

Claim 1 recites: a cited data detecting section operable to detect a cited part of received video data or audio data that is cited from mail data created by a creator different from a creator of the received mail, as cited data, from the mail data received by the data receiving section; that the cited data includes information relating to the creator of the mail data in a specified region; and that the cited data detecting section detects the cited part by using the information relating to the creator. Applicants respectfully submit that the above-noted features of claim 1 are not disclosed, suggested, or otherwise rendered obvious by any combination of Gupta and McLaren.

Gupta is directed to a user interface for creating and viewing annotations to media content. Gupta describes the aim of the disclosure is to create a “classroom discussion” during a viewing of multimedia content such that a user may add an annotation while viewing the multimedia presentation, view annotations left by his or her classmates, or add an annotation in response to the annotations left by his or her classmates ([0007]).

In order to facilitate a method for adding and viewing annotations, Gupta teaches the use of various “seek options” available to a user to find and view a desired annotation within the multimedia content ([0011] and [0133]-[0136]). For example, Gupta teaches that the creator of the original multimedia content is able to use a “seek and skip to next” option while viewing annotated multimedia content (which includes the original multimedia content and one or more annotations) to skip through the original multimedia content and view only the added

annotations. Additionally, Applicants note that Gupta teaches that each of the annotations contains header information identifying the annotation such that an annotation created by student A may be differentiated from an annotation created by student B ([0061]).

In view of the above, Gupta merely teaches that the header information in the annotation created by student A is used to differentiate the annotation created by student A from the annotation created by student B in order to produce the various “seek” options. However, Applicants note that there is no indication in Gupta that information identifying a creator of the original content (i.e., creator of the original multimedia content) is compared to the header information in the annotation created by student A to differentiate the annotation from the original multimedia content.

In other words, Gupta contains no disclosure that information identifying a creator of the original multimedia content is used to differentiate between the original multimedia content and the added annotations. Accordingly, Applicants note that Gupta fails to disclose that information related to the creator of the cited data is used to differentiate between the cited data and the mail data created by a creator of the received mail, as required by claim 1.

McLaren discloses allowing a user to control a playback speed of a video stream by selecting trick play streams in which the playback speed of the video stream is altered (McLaren, Col. 5, Lines 45-50). However, Applicants note that McLaren fails to disclose that information related to the creator of the cited data is used to differentiate between the cited data and the mail data created by a creator of the received mail, as required by claim 1.

In contrast to Gupta and McLaren, amended claim 1 requires that information related to the creator of the cited data is used to differentiate between the cited data and the mail data created by a creator of the received mail.

In particular, amended claim 1 recites: a cited data detecting section operable to detect a cited part of received video data or audio data that is cited from mail data created by a creator different from a creator of the received mail, as cited data, from the mail data received by the

data receiving section; that the cited data includes information relating to the creator of the mail data in a specified region; and that the cited data detecting section detects the cited part by using the information relating to the creator.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that any combination of Gupta and McLaren fails to disclose, suggest, or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren.

Claims 2 and 4-7 are patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren based at least on their dependency from claim 1.

Claim 8 recites detecting a cited part of video data or audio data that is cited from mail data created by a creator different from a creator of a received mail, as cited data, from the received mail data, that the cited data includes information relating to the creator of the mail data in a specified region, and that the cited data is detected by using the information relating to the creator. Applicants respectfully submit that any combination of Gupta and McLaren fails to disclose, suggest, or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features of claim 8 for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claim 8 is patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren.

Claims 9 and 11-14 are patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren based at least on their dependency from claim 8.

Claim 15 recites a cited data detecting section operable to detect a cited part of received video data or audio data that is cited from mail data created by a creator different from a creator of the received mail, as cited data, from the mail data received by the data receiving section, that the cited data includes information relating to the creator of the mail data in a specified region, and the cited data detecting section detects the cited part by using the information relating to the creator. Applicants respectfully submit that any combination of Gupta and McLaren fails to disclose, suggest, or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features of claim 15 for reasons

similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claim 15 is patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 11-15 are clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner believes that there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tetsuyuki NAKAYASU

/Stephen W. Kopchik/

By 2010.11.15 12:50:16 -05'00'

Stephen W. Kopchik
Registration No. 61,215
Attorney for Applicants

SWK/ats
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 15, 2010